

Remarks

In response to a restriction requirement made final, claims 1-22 and 33-37 have been cancelled without prejudiced to the filing of a further divisional application.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 23, 24, and 27-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Tang et al., U.S. Patent 5,294,870.

Claim 23 has been amended for purposes of clarification to clearly distinguish the present invention over Tang. A comparison of Fig. 2 of Tang et al. with Fig. 2 of the present invention clearly illustrates the differences between the two inventions and is reflected in amended claim 23. In Tang et al., G and R are not part of the organic **LED**. The blue-emitting EL is separate from the non-blue dopants, G and R, by means of a passive phosphor layer which absorbs the blue light and excites the red and green fluorescent materials. In contrast, the present invention does not employ fluorescent materials as non-blue dopants. Furthermore, Fig. 2 of the present invention shows that the blue dopant is dispersed simultaneously with non-blue dopants, 50a and 50b. These are angle deposited as opposed to the blue dopant. There are no phosphor layers in between. All three dopants of the present invention emit light through electroluminescence. Tang et al. teach a different approach to organic light emitting devices (OLEDs).

As pointed out at the bottom of page 6 to the top of page 7, the materials employed as dopants for blue, red and green are known electroluminescent materials. In Tang et al., only the blue dopant is an EL, electroluminescent, whereas the green and red materials are fluorescent. As pointed out in the examples, and throughout the specification, the advantage of the present invention is that the blue dopant is deposited on all three sub-pixels, but in the green and red sub-pixels, the green and red dopants effectively dominate the emission spectrum so that any blue emission from the sub-pixels is inconsequential.

In view of the above and amended claim 23, the Examiner's rejection is inappropriate and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 30 under the same ground by Tang et al., is also respectfully traversed. In claim 30, the claimed invention includes an integrated shadow mask that corrects

for parallax. Tang et al. is totally silent as to this feature, and thus, Tang et al. cannot anticipate claim 30 and claims dependent thereon.


Claims 25 and 26 have been separately rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly unpatentable by combining Tang et al. with Shieh et al. for claim 26, and Shi et al., U.S. 5,668,438, for claim 25. It is respectfully submitted that allowance of the independent claims 23 and 30 render allowable dependent claims 25 and 26 for the same reasons provided above in rebutting the Tang et al. reference.

A prompt and favorable reply is earnestly solicited.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by current amendment, captioned "Version with Markings to Show Changes Made".

Respectfully submitted,

5/13/83
Date


Ronald A. Daignault
Reg. No. 25,968
Merchant & Gould P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
(612) 371-5381

RAD:kf

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

In the Claims

Claims 1-22 and 33-37 have been cancelled.

Claims have been amended as follows:

23. (Amended) An article comprising an organic light emitting full color display panel wherein a blue dopant [is] and a non-blue dopant, which both emit light through electroluminescence, are dispersed in at least one non-blue sub-pixel.